

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached hereto are three (3) sheets of corrected formal drawings. The corrected formal drawings incorporate the following drawing changes:

In FIGs. 1-3, the legend "Background Art" has been added.

In FIG. 1, the reference numeral "30" has been removed.

It is respectfully requested that the corrected formal drawings be approved and made a part of the record of the above-identified application.

Attachment: Replacement sheets

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-13 are now present in the application. The abstract, the drawings, and claims 1 and 4-7 have been amended. Claims 10-13 have been added. Claim 1 is independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. §119

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Drawings Objections

The drawings have been objected to due to the presence of minor informalities. Applicants have submitted three (3) sheets of corrected formal drawings and amended the specification to address the Examiner's requested changes. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that these objections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the drawings objections are respectfully requested.

Specification Objections

The abstract has been objected to due to the presence of minor informalities. In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this objection has been addressed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under Obviousness-type Double Patenting

Claim 1 stands provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/721,320. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, claim 1 of the present application has been amended to recite "the other end of the switch lever directly pressing the switch when an external force is applied to the button," which is not recited in amended independent claim 1 of the '320 Application. Accordingly, it is believed that amended independent claim 1 clearly defines over amended independent claim 1 of the '320 Application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under obviousness-type double patenting are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been addressed. Accordingly, all pending claims are now definite and clear. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103

Claims 1-4 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujiyama, U.S. Patent No. 4,977,298. Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by, or alternatively, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiyama. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiyama in view of Chapin, U.S. 3,244,848. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. Without conceding to the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, but merely to timely advance the prosecution of the application, as the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements including "a switch lever having one end fixed to a backside of the display panel and the other end disposed over the switch, the other end of the switch lever directly pressing the switch when an external force is applied to the button."

Support for the above combination of elements set forth in amended independent claim 1 can be found in FIGs. 5-10 as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit that the above combination of elements set forth in amended independent claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

The Examiner referred to Fujiyama's extending element in FIGs. 5a-c extending from the left end of the knot 30 toward the left direction as the switch lever as recited in claim 1. As shown in FIGs. 5a-c of Fujiyama, the left end of Fujiyama's extending element is fixed to the

upper casing 31 (referred to by the Examiner as the display panel), and the right end of the Fujiyama's extending element extends from the left end of the knob 30. However, Fujiyama's switch 26 is at the bottom side of the substrate board 22. When an external force applies to the knob 30, Fujiyama's knob 30 or the right end of Fujiyama's extending element will not directly press the switch 26. Instead, the external force will be applied to the substrate board 22 such that Fujiyama's switch 26 is pressed by the projection 28 at the lower casing 27. Therefore, Fujiyama fails to teach "the other end of the switch lever directly pressing the switch when an external force is applied to the button" as recited in amended claim 1.

With regard to the Examiner's reliance on Chapin, this reference has only been relied on for its teachings related to dependent claim 5. This reference also fails to disclose the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, this reference fails to cure the deficiencies of Fujiyama.

Accordingly, neither of the utilized references individually or in combination teaches or suggests the limitations of amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 1 clearly defines over the teachings of the utilized references.

In addition, claims 2-9 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claim 1, which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-9 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly,

reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are respectfully requested.

Additional Claims

Claims 10-13 has been added for the Examiner's consideration. Applicants respectively submit that claims 10-13 depend, either directly or indirectly, from amended independent claim 1, and is therefore allowable based on its dependence from amended independent claim 1, which is believed to be allowable. Consideration and allowance of claims 10-13 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant


Attachment: Replacement Sheets